

**MINUTES OF THE REGULAR PLANNING BOARD MEETING
MONDAY, DECEMBER 8, 2008
COUNCIL CHAMBERS, CITY HALL
2263 SANTA CLARA AVENUE – 7:00 PM**

President Kohlstrand called the meeting to order at 7:07 p.m.

FLAG SALUTE: Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft led the flag salute.

ROLL CALL:
PRESENT: President Kohlstrand, Vice-President Ezzy Ashcraft, Board members Autorino and McNamara.

ABSENT: Board members Cook, Cunningham and Lynch

STAFF PRESENT: Andrew Thomas, Planning Services Manager/Secretary to the Planning Board; Jon Biggs, Planning Services Manager, Assistant City Attorney Mohammed Hill, Douglas Vu, Planner III, Althea Carter, Executive Assistant/Recording Secretary, Elizabeth Cook and Eric Fonstein, Development Services Department (DSD), Obaid Khan, Public Works.

4. MINUTES:
Minutes from the meeting of August 11, 2008. Continued to the meeting of January 12, 2009.

Minutes from the meeting of October 27, 2008. Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft moved and Board member Autorino seconded the motion to approve the minutes of October 27, 2008.

The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

Minutes from the meeting of November 24, 2008 (pending)

5. AGENDA CHANGES AND DISCUSSION:
President Kohlstrand moved Items 8-A and 8-B from Consent to Regular Agenda.

6. STAFF COMMUNICATIONS:

Written Report

6-A. Future Agendas. Staff presented the report on future agenda items.

6-B. Zoning Administrator Report – Meeting of December 2, 2008. Staff presented the report on the Zoning Administrator meeting.

Oral Report

Del Monte Update – nothing new since the last update.

Alameda Point Update – nothing new since the last update.

President Kohlstrand asked that the items under Oral Report be removed from future agendas when there is no update from staff.

7. ORAL COMMUNICATIONS:

- * Anyone may address the Board on a topic not on the agenda under this item by submitting a speaker's information slip, subject to the 5-minute time limit.

J. Reynolds, representing Earthship.org, advised the Board of a presentation by this organization scheduled for December 9, 2008, 6 p.m. at the Alameda Free library. Earthship has been building sustainable homes from recycled materials worldwide for 40 years. Board members and citizens are encouraged to attend.

8. CONSENT CALENDAR:

Consent Calendar items are considered routine and will be enacted, approved or adopted by one motion unless a request for removal for discussion or explanation is received from the Planning Board or a member of the public by submitting a speaker slip for that item.

Consent Calendar items moved to Regular Agenda.

9. REGULAR AGENDA ITEMS:

8-A. Adopt 2009 Planning Board Meeting Calendar

President Kohlstrand proposed the meeting scheduled for December 28, 2009 be canceled. Board member Autorino moved/Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion to adopt the *revised* 2009 Planning Board meeting calendar canceling the meeting of December 28, 2009.

The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

- 8-B. Reuse Plan Amendment Recommendation.** Recommended amendments to the Community Reuse Plan for the North Housing Parcel. The North Housing Parcel is located north of Singleton Avenue. The site was declared surplus by the Navy in November 2007. The property is proposed to be conveyed for public and private uses. It is anticipated that the existing vacant housing may be demolished and new market rate and affordable housing, parks, open space, and civic uses may be constructed consistent with the City of Alameda General Plan.
Continued from November 24, 2008. (DP/EC)

In response to an inquiry by President Kohlstrand Development Services Department (DSD) staff responded that during public discussions three schemes were presented which would guide the lay out of future housing and new roads. These discussions produced six overarching guidelines. Most important were the guiding principles detailed on pages seven through twelve in the proposed amendment to the Community Reuse Plan. The purpose of the Plan is to provide the Planning Board with guidelines for the area once a master developer and non-profit are selected for the project.

Board member McNamara referred to the layout on page 12 and asked if this incorporates all previous direction provided by the Planning Board.

Staff responded that guideline number six (page 12) focuses on connecting the residential use to other public amenities in the neighborhood. This approach is focused on pathways to the waterfront for bicyclists and pedestrians, as well as active and passive access to parks.

Vice-President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the second page of Attachment 2 which states "Is there an opportunity to increase neighborhood commercial" she inquired whether the retail referred to is the Alameda Landing project.

Staff responded affirmative.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft inquired about the proposed miracle league field referred to in Attachment 2 page two. She asked if the location for this field is the same as discussed in phase 3 of Alameda Landing.

Staff responded that a deal for a field between the developer and the Miracle League had not been finalized. The Miracle League has approached the Recreation and Park Department about the possibility of another site on the eight acres proposed for Rec and Park. This is a proposed idea for a potential location and is not the same site previously proposed to the developer.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page six of the proposed draft amendment, which states "Emphasize sustainable community design". She would prefer substituting the word "employ" for "emphasize". The second sentence in the paragraph states, "explore green building techniques". She would prefer to substitute the word "employ" for "explore". She stated that the same language used on page 15 of the draft amendment would be applicable in this section.

President Kohlstrand referred to page six, second paragraph, second sentence "Residential neighborhoods should not be gated". She wants to add "or walled" to this sentence. In the next paragraph: "De-emphasize the automobile ..." she referred to the last sentence: "Locate higher-density residential uses along or near major transit lines...." she would prefer this to read "open space, *sidewalks*, and trails". On page 14 policy 2-18 states: "Improve accessibility via alternative modes of transit by encouraging...." She would like "major arterial corridors" changed to "major transit

corridors". She is not supportive of policy 2-20 which discourages driveways on all major arterials.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated she recognizes the challenges associated with living on a major street. She envisioned a development similar to Bayport where driveway access is provided through a back alley.

President Kohlstrand stated she would be comfortable with inserting the word "minimize" instead of "discourage" the number of driveways.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to a typo on page 14 2-16. Change "hosing" to "housing".

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 15, 2-25. She asked if the term lower incomes refers to low and very-low incomes.

Staff responded yes.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated there are two paragraphs referred to as 2-25. Under 2-25 under Community Design Policies she suggests removing the word "outstanding" as it refers to the street tree system. She asked for clarification on paragraph 2-26.

Staff responded it is included to continue the scale and variety of architectural styles that exist throughout Alameda.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 19, Section 9.0 Implementation Strategy. She inquired what remediation would take place in areas where the soil has not been excavated should a future decision be made to remove these buildings.

Staff responded that the developer would work with the regulatory body, the Department of Toxic Substance Control. If there was a limited demolition a decision may be made to test the structure and the soil while the demolition occurs with targeted off hauling of any found contaminants. Another option is to assume two feet of soil would be pulled off throughout the portions of North housing that were not dealt with previously.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated the Navy is responsible for clean up of the groundwater. She asked if the Navy is also responsible for clean up of the soil.

Staff responded negative. The Navy is not responsible for future development costs.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft inquired whether the developer or the city would be responsible for soil contamination.

Staff responded that costs associated with soil contamination are the responsibility of the developer.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft asked if this information would be disclosed to future homebuyers.

Staff responded affirmative.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 21 number 6 and asked how removal of two feet of soil beneath buildings would occur.

Staff responded that if existing housing were demolished or roads were re-routed, structural demolition would occur, then two feet of soil would be removed.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft requested that it be made clear in this paragraph that buildings and hardscape would be demolished and not lifted.

Staff advised the Board that an additional policy on fiscal neutrality would be added to the Plan.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft moved/Board member McNamara seconded the motion to approve the recommended amendments to the Community Reuse Plan for the North Housing Parcel with changes.

The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

9-A. Second Unit Ordinance. Proposed amendment to the Alameda Municipal Code to allow attached or detached secondary housing units to be constructed on sites with a single-family dwelling. In compliance with State Secondary Housing Unit law, the proposed ordinance provides for the administrative review and approval of secondary units meeting the development standards contained in the code.
Continued from November 24, 2008. (JB)

Staff presented the report. Five changes were made to the ordinance since it was last presented to the Board. The changes were to provide for an aggregate lot coverage. Staff has recommended 60% aggregate lot coverage, sidewalks, parking spaces and driveways would be included. A minimum lot size of 7,500 square feet has been included. The principal place of residence of the building owner shall be either the principal residence or the second unit on the site. Creation of a second unit shall not involve any changes to existing street facing walls nor existing floor and roof elevations. Requirement for parking space for second unit and it must function independently of other parking spaces on the site. The location of the parking space must meet all requirements of parking space locations contained in the Alameda Municipal Code (AMC).

Staff is concerned about defining principal place of residence as well as enforcement of the requirement that the building owner live in one of the residences. Staff requested feedback from the Board on the 60% lot coverage. Staff stated that the purpose of the

State requiring cities to provide secondary housing unit regulations is to encourage development of second units. The regulations developed should facilitate rather than discourage the creation of second units.

Ezzy asked for staff input on info provided by AAPS concerning owner occupancy.

The public hearing was opened:

C. Buckley stated that the ordinance will permit second units by right as long as standards are met. Neither public review or design review is required. Alameda Architectural Preservation Society (AAPS) suggests using the City of Berkeley's ordinance as a guideline for incorporating owner occupancy requirement. To avoid future disputes AAPS would like the Historic Preservation Ordinance cited specifically within this ordinance. Requests that second units which do not conform to the standards require design review.

The public hearing was closed.

Staff requested feedback from the Board for the purpose of the owner occupancy requirement.

President Kohlstrand stated the difficulty of reviewing the second unit ordinance independently of the housing element. She inquired whether there was a goal of housing production to be generated as a result of this ordinance.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated the purpose of the City creating the secondary unit ordinance was to tailor it to meet existing housing criteria.

Board member McNamara inquired whether second units would count towards affordable housing requirement.

Staff stated that since there is no income limitation on who can rent the units on these sites it will not count towards the affordable housing goals. The units will count towards the overall production of housing in Alameda. Based on existing regulations Staff stated it will be difficult for a property owner to meet the requirements for a second unit given the restrictions in Alameda. There are not many sites in Alameda that will be able to provide a second unit in compliance with all the regulations without getting an exception, for example a use permit.

President Kohlstrand stated there is a concern in the community with protecting the character and integrity of the residential neighborhoods. She inquired if staff was stating that the 7,500 square foot minimum lot size along with the 60% lot coverage puts greater restrictions on an owners' ability to create a second unit.

Staff responded the 60% coverage does not present a major problem but the location of where the buildings are positioned on the site (near or at the required front yard

setback) present obstacles. A second unit would need to be constructed behind the principal residence requiring a driveway be built to access parking where not enough room exists to create a driveway.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcrafts asked if there is a requirement that the second unit be detached or could it be an addition to the principal residence. She referred to California government statute code number 65852.150 which states in part: second units are a valuable form of housing in California, second units provide housing for family members, students, the elderly, in home health care providers, the disabled and others at below market prices within existing neighborhoods. Homeowners who create second units benefit from added income and an increased sense of security. She interprets this to mean there is some financial gain to homeowners who create second units. In the Los Angeles area the units are used primarily for extended families. She supports the owner occupied requirement and leans towards using the City of Berkeley's guidelines.

Staff responded there is no requirement that the second unit be detached.

The Assistant City Attorney stated there is statutory law that allows the stipulation that a unit be owner occupied. There is case law to support both sides. Monitoring and enforcement are concerns of staff.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft suggests deed restriction be added to account for monitoring and enforcement of regulation. This ordinance allows homeowners to create second units which they would otherwise be unable to do. This ordinance is an advantage to those homeowners and it does not seem unreasonable to require owner occupancy of one of the units.

The Assistant City Attorney clarified that State law does allow the creation of second units.

President Kohlstrand asked for Board input on the owner occupancy requirement.

Board member McNamara is comfortable incorporating the City of Berkeley's approach into the ordinance which provides the owner and the City some flexibility to account for unexpected situations. The assumption is that if the owner occupies a unit on the property it will be well maintained which is not necessarily the case. She supports owner occupancy of one of the units.

Board member Autorino favors Berkeley's ordinance but is concerned that it allows the owner to be gone for up to three years at a time. There is no restriction on how many times the owner can be away from the property and there is no mention of what happens to the property when the owner is away. The assumption is both units can be rented during this time.

A Board discussion ensued on allowing the owner to be away from the property for a specified period of time.

President Kohlstrand stated that since there are only four Board members in attendance decisions taken must be unanimous.

Staff prepared a hybrid ordinance containing staff's recommendations as well as those proposed by AAPS for the Board's consideration.

A Board discussion ensued on the hybrid ordinance presented by Staff.

The Assistant City Attorney stated the easiest enforcement option is to issue citations for non-compliance.

President Kohlstrand referred to AAPS' request to include language stating that the second unit ordinance does not preempt the demolition controls in the historic preservation ordinance and AAPS's reference for clarification to section 9-R of the revised draft ordinance. If not all requirements of the second unit ordinance are met design review is required.

Staff clarified that ministerial approval is granted only if all standards in the ordinance are met. If a use permit is required design review could be permitted.

The Board concurs with the recommendations by AAPS being stated in the ordinance.

President Kohlstrand asked if any member of the Board wanted changes to the minimum lot size or the 60% lot size requirement. No Board member requested changes to these aspects of the ordinance.

Board member McNamara stated her hesitation to including specific reasons in the ordinance for a homeowners absence. She asked what options exist for a homeowner that has a legitimate reason that is not specifically stated in the ordinance.

Staff stated that only the specific reasons stated in the ordinance would apply without exception.

Board member McNamara asked if a homeowner in this situation could appeal?

Staff stated a homeowner could appeal the interpretation that their reasons are not legitimate or apply for a use permit. Staff does not expect the findings could be made to grant a use permit to allow the homeowner not to live on the site.

Board member McNamara asked if the State's ordinance has a requirement of owner occupancy.

Staff responded that the State does not require owner occupancy to be an element of a city's ordinance nor is it prohibited.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft is in favor of using the language suggested by Staff regarding owner occupancy:

President Kohlstrand asked for input from staff on whether specific reasons for an owners' absence should be stipulated in the ordinance.

Board member McNamara stated the reasons listed, health, family issues, military, are general enough to cover most possibilities for an owners' absence.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated that if specific reasons are not listed the onus is on the Planning Director to determine whether an owners' absence would be allowed.

President Kohlstrand read the Board's recommendation regarding owner occupancy "The principal place of residence of the building site owner shall be either the second unit or the primary unit. If neither unit is owner occupied only one of the units on the site can be rented. However, an owner may be absent from their principal place of residence on the site for up to twelve consecutive months. The Planning and Building Director may grant two twelve month extensions to the initial twelve months at the request of the owner. Each unit on the site may be rented when the owner is absent from the site during this time period".

Board member Autorino moved/Board member McNamara seconded the motion to recommend the Second Unit Ordinance with changes to the City Council for approval. The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

9-B. Design Review and Variance – PLN008-0035 – 1150 Bay Street. The applicant requests Design Review approval to remodel a single-family residence. A Variance is required to reconstruct a shed roof over the north facing entrance of the house, which will extend the existing 3-foot side yard setback to a 2-foot side yard setback, where a minimum 5-foot side yard setback is required. (DV)

Staff presented the report and stated a correction on the title for this item. The existing side yard setback is 2 feet not 3 feet as stated in the title.

President Kohlstrand asked based on the correction how the side yard setback is affected by the proposal.

Staff stated that there is no change to the side yard setback. The existing 2 foot setback would be maintained. This proposal was presented to the Historical Advisory Board (HAB). The Board was supportive of the proposal with the exception of the front porch and requested the applicant return with a modified porch design. The HAB approved the revised design and granted a Certificate of Approval. Staff is recommending approval of the proposal.

Board member McNamara asked for confirmation from Staff that the existing 2 foot setback would not change.

Staff confirmed the 2 foot setback will not change.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft asked Staff whether the encroachment into the side yard setback was attributed to the roof.

Staff stated yes the edge of the eave would be two feet away from the property boundary.

The public hearing was opened.

C. Coombs, spoke on behalf of the applicants. He is their son-in-law. The applicants have been working with the City for over three years on this project. The project has been approved by the HAB and endorsed by the former Executive Director of the state of California Department of Historical Preservation. The variance is not being requested for the front porch. The variance is being requested to restore several historic elements that currently exist within the side yard setback.

B. Woolley spoke in opposition to the project. The significant work being done on the home is an opportunity to eliminate the existing encroachment not preserve it.

R. Ramos spoke in opposition to the proposed encroachment. The existing design does not provide enough walk space and visitors walk onto his driveway to access this property. He suggested a smaller porch to eliminate the encroachment issue. Letters from neighbors in opposition to the proposed setbacks have been provided to the Board.

J. Wilkins, owner of Custom Kitchens, spoke in support of the project. His company is working on the remodel and states that the applicant is working hard to restore the property.

D. Keltner spoke in opposition to the project. She agreed that the proposed home would be beautiful but she does not feel it is comparable to the size of the lot. She is in opposition to the proposed encroachment and the size of the porch.

The public hearing was closed.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft disclosed that she visited the property earlier. She stated the existing brick walkway extends 3½ feet beyond the front of the house. She asked staff how far the proposed porch entrance would extend out from the front of the house.

Staff responded that the gabled portion of the proposal would extend from the door approximately 22 feet. The support columns would be setback four feet from the property boundary.

Board member Autorino clarified the Boards' question as being how much is the front setback reduced by the new construction.

Staff clarified that the proposed porch would extend seven feet beyond the house and the stairs would extend 31/2 feet beyond the porch.

President Kohlstrand inquired if the applicant had stated that originally access to the house was provided by a side entrance and whether the applicant is attempting to restore this original design. She asked if the new design of the porch is also an attempt to restore the original design.

C. Coombs replied that they have no direct evidence to the original size of the porch. He does believe the existing columns are the original columns of the house. His best evidence that originally there was a side entrance to the home is the design of the other homes in the neighborhood.

President Kohlstrand stated she would support the setback encroachments to restore the property to its original design. She inquired whether this could be accomplished without adding seven feet to the front and extending it forward.

C. Coombs stated the design plans are supported by the Historical Advisory Board. He supports the design because it provides a covered walkway for the homeowners.

President Kohlstrand asked about a previous speakers' comment that numerous letters in opposition to the project had been submitted by neighbors. She stated that the Board did not receive these letters.

Staff responded that letters referenced by the speaker were submitted to the Historical Advisory Board. No opposition letters were submitted to the Planning Board.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft likes the proposed design. She is concerned that the only proponents of the project are the applicant's son-in-law and the kitchen contractor. She questioned whether, with the proposed design, it would be necessary for visitors' to access the site through the neighbors' property.

In response to a Board inquiry Staff and the applicants' representative clarified the positioning of the front door and the wall on the proposed design.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to page 5 of the staff report and the reference to Alameda Municipal Code section 30-5.7. She believes there is more of an impact for a walled addition as opposed to a porch. She is concerned with the neighbor's objections to the project.

Board member Autorino stated the design was excellent but he has reservations based on the neighbor's opposition.

Board member McNamara has some concerns but believes the design will enhance the home and the neighborhood. Her concern is the seven foot porch extension encroachment on the front yard. She asked if the porch could be scaled back without running the design intent.

The applicant responded that the seven feet is the minimum depth architecturally for the front porch.

In response to a Board inquiry, the applicant responded that originally the depth was closer to eight feet but has been reduced to seven feet. He expressed concern that only the neighbors who oppose the project are present tonight. He stated that there are several neighbors who support the project.

President Kohlstrand stated her initial concern about additional encroachment into the side yard setback but now understands, based on Staff's explanation, that the setback will be one foot further back than it is now. She has been swayed by the applicant's desire to restore original design features to the house. She understands the neighbor's concerns about the extension into the front yard but the Board is not being asked to make a decision on this aspect of the design. The criteria for this area of the design is within the code requirement unless the Board has an issue with the design and this does not appear to be the case.

Board member McNamara stated that the project appears to meet all the findings required for design review. The applicant has done quite a few revisions to the design to accommodate the neighbors as well as the desire to restore/retain original architectural designs.

President Kohlstrand asked if any member of the Board had any issues with any of the findings stated in the staff report. The Board responded no.

Board member McNamara moved/Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft seconded the motion to approve the design review and variance for the remodel of the residence at 1150 Bay Street based upon the findings in the draft resolution.

The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

9-C. Recommendation to Endorse the Parking Management Plan for the Park Street and West Alameda Business Districts. The applicant, the City of Alameda, is requesting that the Planning Board review and endorse a parking management plan for the Park Street and West Alameda Business Districts. The parking management plan outlines a series of actions that the City could take in the future to improve the supply and management of on and off street parking to support the business areas. (AT/EF)

Eric Fonstein from DSD presented the report. The report is a result of a collaboration between Development Services, Planning and Building, and Public Works. The two

primary goals of the project were to enhance management of existing supply by discouraging use of on street parking and encouraging use of private and public off street parking and to lower barriers to private investment in business expansion.

In response to a Board inquiry regarding in lieu fees staff stated the current fee is approximately \$6,000 per space. Staff stated the cost per stall could be organized around the cost of a parking lot as opposed to a parking structure, which would reduce the numbers stated in the report.

Staff informed the Board that the West Alameda Business Association (WABA) has unanimously endorsed the proposed parking plan. The plan will be presented to the Park Street Business Association (PSBA) in January. The plan will be presented to the EDC in January since there was not a quorum at the November meeting. The plan will be presented to the Transportation Commission on Wednesday and to the City Council in February 2009.

In response to a Board inquiry Staff stated the ordinance for off street parking will be presented to the Planning Board in January 2009.

No speaker slips were received.

President Kohlstrand stated she was looking for more specifics and would like to review the parking study more thoroughly. She believes staff is going in the right direction. She would like to see more specific recommendations on pricing. She stated the burden for providing parking seemed to be solely on new development and it may be more equitable to find a strategy where the costs are borne by new as well as existing businesses through an establishing an assessment district. She likes the idea of shared parking and would like more detail on this strategy. She was hoping to see more of a plan on future parking needs/requirements as it relates to land use including a public parking lot. She would like to see more discussion on how in-lieu fees are used and how should these monies be expended in the future. She would have liked to hear more about existing conditions since the new parking garage was opened. She stated there appears to be more not less of a financial burden on smaller businesses with regards to the proposed parking in-lieu fee structure.

In response to a Board inquiry Staff stated if a residential neighborhood in a business district felt impacted by the lack of on street parking it can petition to assess itself to cover the costs of a parking district. Parking for two hours would be permitted for non-residents. This is to encourage parking off street in a garage or parking lot. All costs associated with a residential parking program including enforcement are included in the program.

Staff is proposing a minimum size of six blocks for a residential parking program. There are some initial costs the City would absorb for example review of the site and the study. Some funds in the in-lieu parking fee account may be used for the initial set-up. A

majority of the residents must agree to the program. If enacted all residents will be assessed the fee.

In response to a Board inquiry staff stated the survey referenced in the staff report was not done to achieve any scientific data, it was used as an additional form of public outreach. Staffs focus in preparing the report was on creating attractive pricing that would move employee parking off streets and into parking garages or lots thereby creating on street parking for residents.

President Kohlstrand stated she was in support of neighborhoods having the option to create an assessment for a residential parking program.

Staff stated preparing the ordinances is an ongoing project and feedback from the Board would provide direction to Staff in crafting the ordinances. Staff is looking for Board direction on the in-lieu fees. In-lieu fees can become a large financial part of a project. Staff has proposed some waivers. A demand waiver would apply to a business that can show the demand for parking created by the business is less than what is stated in the code and the calculation would be based on that number. Required parking could be provided entirely on site or a combination of on site parking and in-lieu fees would suffice. To qualify for this option a business must be in close proximity to one of the garages or on a transit route.

President Kohlstrand inquired whether a traffic engineer is required to prepare the demand waiver.

Staff responded this was required to ensure standard practices and proper methods are being followed.

Staff asked for Board input on a historic resource waiver. In the current code if a building is over ten years old upgrading parking for a new or more intense use is not required. Staff is proposing, for Park Street and Webster Street, if it is an historic building and providing parking would require alterations to the building that would affect its historic character then parking requirements could be waived. Staff discussions included continuing to require in-lieu fees for these types of projects and provide the Planning Board with the option to waive in-lieu fees if requiring the fee would make the project infeasible. Staff is requesting Board input on whether this scenario should also apply to a business located in a non-historic building.

President Kohlstrand stated that from a land use perspective removing the minimum requirement altogether makes sense. Not factored in is The design guidelines state that not to disrupt the continuous frontage on Park and Webster streets. This is not reflected in the Plan. By eliminating a min parking req is a way to achieve this design guideline but this approach eliminates funding sources.

Staff stated if a waiver is granted a condition of the waiver would require any off street parking to become communal parking. This would contribute to the pool of shared parking spaces.

Board member Autorino asked if a private business has a lot with ten spaces but all of the spaces are not being used, is the business permitted the option of renting them out.

Staff responded that for employee shared parking the 1,000-foot requirement would not apply.

A Board discussion ensued on the amount of parking required for a business and options should not all spaces be needed by the business.

Staff stated that this situation currently exists in some areas of Park Street.

President Kohlstrand would like to move the shared parking program forward starting with existing parking lots that are not being fully utilized.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft asked whether the Wilbur Smith study included information on the need for employee parking.

Staff responded that was not part of the scope of the project.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft asked whether the Park Street and Webster Street Business Associations could survey members to determine need.

Pres Kohlstrand stated she is encouraged that business owners are behind this Plan.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated the Plan should include strategies that get people out of their cars. Providing additional parking spaces for City employees on the top floor of the garage is great but she asked if bicycle lockers would be provided also. She would like to see spaces in the civic center garage allocated for Zip cars. She asked that staff plan to provide the Board with an update on the civic center garage usage. She stated that merchants of a certain size should provide adjacent bicycle parking.

Staff responded that negotiations are ongoing with a company to provide Zip type cars and Staff plans to use one or two spaces in the garage for this purpose. The City has received some grant funding for bicycle parking and Staff is planning for bicycle racks at City Hall and other city buildings as well as at some business locations that requested bicycle parking. The City of Oakland is allowing bicycle parking at old meter poles.

Staff requested input from the Board on removing the rolling ten in the Park and Webster districts. Staff also asked the Board to provide input on whether there should be a distinction on if the building is historic or not.

Board member Autorino agreed with President Kohlstrand that businesses of a certain size should be excluded from the parking requirement. He stated that buildings should in fact have historic significance and not just ten years old.

A Board discussion ensued on whether a distinction between historic or non-historic is important, contributions to off street parking and street design, protection of continuous street façade, fee structure and establishing minimum thresholds, more criteria to apply for a fee waiver, and eliminating the minimum parking requirement.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft referred to the staff report which states that many planners are recommending only maximum not minimum parking requirements. This is a good time for the Board to consider this option.

Staff stated that during discussions with the consultant, based on supply and demand in Alameda it is a matter of management not supply. The goal is to retain parking in the Park Street district. There are residential areas in this area suffering spillover.

President Kohlstrand stated there are advocates for changing parking policies nationwide. Alameda is an older city where much of the older character has been maintained. If parking is limited, alternatives must be provided.

Staff stated that implementing no minimums removes contributions to the in-lieu fund, which reduces funding sources.

In response to a Board inquiry staff responded that WABA is supportive of the recommendations and relaxed on site parking requirements. WABA had no comment on the minimums.

President Kohlstrand suggested staff get input from PSBA on these issues as currently there is more of a parking issue in the Park Street district.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft stated she was interested in new technology for replacing parking meters. She suggested reconfiguration of parking spaces in the parking lot on Central near the theatre. The spaces do not accommodate larger SUVs.

Staff will return to the Board at a future date with information on the following: in-lieu fees and waiver program (size, threshold), parking in the Park Street area since the garage and statistics on parking in the garage, how are in-lieu fees being generated and spent, more specifics on Redwood City ordinance, information on options for establishing assessment districts (commercial parking district), information on a shared parking clearinghouse, next steps for future parking lots or structures in the North Park Street and North Webster Street areas, employee parking demand, information on the survey and how to incorporate facilities for alternative modes (car share, bicycle racks/lockers),

Board member McNamara stated staff should consider alternatives for in-lieu fees other than parking structures or lots.

President Kohlstrand stated the Board would like to know how much is being generated from the in-lieu fees.

President Kohlstrand thanked Staff for all the hard work done on the Plan.

Vice President Ezzy Ashcraft moved/Board member McNamara seconded the motion to continue this item to the meeting of January 12, 2009.

The motion passed with the following voice vote – 4, Noes: 0, Absent: 3.

10. WRITTEN COMMUNICATIONS:

None.

11. BOARD COMMUNICATIONS:

Board members may ask a question for clarification, make a brief announcement or make a brief report on his or her activities. In addition, the Board may provide a referral to staff or other resources for factual information, request staff to report back to the body at a subsequent meeting concerning a City matter or, through the chair, direct staff to

None.

12. ADJOURNMENT: @ 11:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Jon Biggs, Secretary
City Planning Board

Andrew Thomas, Secretary
City Planning Board

This meeting was audio and video taped.